

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 13 are in the case.

The Office Action refers to claim objections.

1. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to claims on which it depends in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01 (n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In this case a Preliminary Amendment dated April 17, 2006 was filed on April 26, 2006 with the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The preliminary Amendment rendered claims 4 and 5 simply dependent. Recognition of the Preliminary Amendment and consideration of amended claims 4 and 5 is respectfully solicited.

1. Claims 9-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot be dependent on another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01 (n). Accordingly, the claims 9-11 have not been further treated on the merits.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In this case a Preliminary Amendment dated

April 17, 2006 was filed on April 26, 2006 with the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The preliminary Amendment rendered claims 9 to 11 simply dependent. Recognition of the Preliminary Amendment and consideration of amended claims 9 to 11 is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

2. Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Regarding claims 1-3,8 and 12, these claims contain terms such as "the capacitor" or "the electrode" without specifying which capacitor or electrodes are being referred to. Note that these components cannot be distinguished by putting drawing numbers in parentheses after the terms, but rather they must be distinguished by using a descriptor such as first, second, third, etc.

The present amendment attempts to clarify the situation. However only one capacitor 24a was found in the claims. Instead it was found that the word capacitance referred to three different contexts.

4. Regarding claim 3, the claim is unclear because it specifies that the second electrode and the electrode of the capacitor on the input side of the amplifier by combined as one electrode. However, claim 1 sets forth that the second electrode is connected to the output of the amplifier.

The present amendment changes claim 3 and replaces the term "input" with the term "output". The language of claim 3 appears to be now consonant

with the language of claim 1.


The Office Action refers to Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicants very much appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter. The claims are being rewritten to place them in fully allowable form.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Winkens et al.

By: 
Horst M. Kasper, their attorney
13 Forest Drive, Warren, NJ. 07059 :
TEL.:(908)526-1717; Reg.No. 28559
Attorney's Docket No.: MSA266

Rep/am